

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Docket No.: 2001 P 13667 US  
App. No.: 09/922,062

JAN 16 2007  
REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-28 are pending.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-3 and 5-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated unpatentable over U.S. Publication 20030046421 by Horvitz et al., ("Horvitz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,630 by Adler et al., ("Adler").

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant respectfully submits independent claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 include novel and nonobvious elements. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). See also *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 include elements which have not been disclosed, taught or suggested by Horvitz and Adler. For example, claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 generally recite:

a message store for storing multimedia messages;

summarization means for automatically summarizing the stored message, wherein said summarization means reduces messages to a list of keywords from a plurality of lists of keywords, each keyword of each list being selectable by a user, said list of keywords applied to the stored message being based upon a sender of a message; and

organization means for organizing content of the stored message into a template, said template including information fields selected by a user and a number of characters for each field selected by said user, wherein said stored message is available for access in accordance with said template for said user. Emphasis added.

The Patent Office is correct in its statement that Horvitz fails to disclose, teach or suggest summarization means which reduces messages to a list of keywords from a plurality of lists of keywords, each keyword of each list being selectable by a user,

Docket No.: 2001 P 13667 US  
App. No.: 09/922,062

said list of keywords applied to the stored message being based upon a sender of a message and organization means for organizing content of the stored message into a template, said template including information fields selected by a user and a number of characters for each field selected by said user.

Adler fails to cure the defects of Horvitz. The Patent Office cites Column 6, line 51 through Column 7, line 15 for support of its assertion that Adler discloses summarization means which reduces messages to a list of keywords from a plurality of lists of keywords, each keyword of each list being selectable by a user, said list of keywords applied to the stored message being based upon a sender of a message and organization means for organizing content of the stored message into a template, said template including information fields selected by a user and a number of characters for each field selected by said user. However, Adler merely discloses summarization of messages and fails to disclose reducing messages to a list of keywords from a plurality of lists of keywords, each keyword of each list being selectable by a user, said list of keywords applied to the stored message being based upon a sender of a message. Emphasis added.

Claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 disclose summarization of messages according to a list of keywords based upon a sender. Thus a summarized message according to claim 1, 5, 13 and 17 from a particular sender may only include words from a user-selected key word list. Contrary to the recited elements of claims 1, 5, 13 and 17, Adler merely allows searching of messages which include a key word. If a message includes a key word, then the entire message, the first predefined number of characters, the sender or only the sender and subject information is sent. (Adler, Column 7, Lines 5-10). Emphasis added. This is not equivalent to a message which is reduced to a list of keywords selectable by a user according to a particular sender.

Consequently, Horvitz and Adler fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element of claims 1, 5, 13 and 17. Under *in re Ryoka*, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 1, 5, 13 and 17. Claims 2-3, 6-12,

Docket No.: 2001 P 13667 US  
App. No.: 09/922,062


14-16 and 18-28 are believed allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable, and it is respectfully requested that the entire application now be passed to formal allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 15 Jan. 07



David D. Chung  
Reg. No. 38,409  
Phone: 408-492-5336

Correspondence Address  
**Customer Number: 28524**  
Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830